DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 294 TM 830 214

AUTHOR Totusek, Patsy F.; Christner, C. A.
TITLE So You Think You Want to Develop an Administrator Evaluation System. . .
INSTITUTION Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO AISD-ORE-82.43
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th Montreal, Quebec, April 11-15, 1983). Attachment A contains small print.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Needs; *Program Development; *School Districts; Surveys; Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS *Austin Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

Interviews with school administrators; surveys of large school districts, local businesses and governmental agencies; and reviews of educational management literature by the Austin Independent School District (AISD) Office of Research and Evaluation indicated that a competency-based instrument for administrator evaluation was needed. This paper focuses on the development of the AISD Administrator Evaluation System, listing the activities that were conducted from September 1981 to February 1983 to complete the revision of the present evaluation system. Several instruments and evaluation procedures were developed as a result of the revision activities. The instruments include: (1) the Administrator Evaluation Form (Attachment A); (2) task descriptions for each major administrative position in the District; (3) a Personal Goal Form for goal development and goal assessment (Attachment B); (4) input forms for district personnel in commenting on an evaluatee's performance; (5) the Administrator Evaluation Schedule (Attachment C); and (6) the Administrative Personnel Evaluation Handbook which will provide details on required and recommended evaluation procedures, evaluation procedures for evaluatees in contractual difficulties, and a list of resources for professional development. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228294

SO YOU THINK YOU WANT TO DEVELOP AN ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION SYSTEM . . .

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

April, 1983

Authors: Patsy F. Totusek, Ph.D.
C. A. Christner, Ph.D.
Office of Research and Evaluation
Austin Independent School District

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. F. Totusek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Publication Number 82.43

Office of Research and Evaluation
Austin Independent School District
Austin, Texas

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

TM 830 214

82.43

SO YOU THINK YOU WANT TO DEVELOP AN ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION SYSTEM . . .

A survey sent to the 100 largest school districts in the United States and Canada revealed most school district officials are interested in learning more about the administrative evaluation systems of other districts. This paper outlines the procedures taken by one district in trying to create a comprehensive Administrator Evaluation System, and warns of possible difficulties in the developmental process. AISD's experience will be useful to other districts who are contemplating revising or developing an Administrator Evaluation System.

Perspective

In the 1970's the AISD Board of Trustees set a high priority on revising its Administrator and Professional Personnel Evaluation Systems. The focus and efforts went first into developing a professional system. A great deal of input was sought from a variety of sources and there was wide review of the prospective system by teachers and administrators. An explanation of the system (procedures, forms, definitions, etc.) was placed in an evaluation handbook which was disseminated the year before the system was implemented. Prior to its use, administrators received an orientation to the new system and participated in required training in evaluation procedures. The system was carefully evaluated in its first years of use and was modified on the basis of the needs identified.

Revision of the Administrator Evaluation System

Following the implementation of the Professional Personnel Evaluation System, attention was turned to the evaluation of administrators. Early in 1979, the AISD Superintendent authorized the Director of Staff Personnel, the Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent, and the Director of the Office of Research and Evaluation (ORE) to begin planning for the revision of the Administrator Evaluation System. Following that authorization a number of activities were performed:

- Interviews were conducted with AISD administrators to identify sources of dissatisfaction with the current Administrator Evaluation System.
- The large school districts in the United States were surveyed with regard to their teacher and administrator evaluation systems.
- A literature review was performed.
- Large Austin area businesses and government agencies were surveyed regarding their systems of managerial evaluation.

The findings for each of these activities are summarized on the following pages.

Summary of Findings

Interviews with AISD Administrators

Interviews with principals and central office administrators in 1979 revealed a great deal of dissatisfaction with the currently used Administrator Evaluation System. Among the complaints were:

- The procedures were too vague.
- The competencies were not defined well.
- Expected performance was not specified.
- There was a lack of feedback.
- Implementation was not uniform in that there were large differences among evaluators.
- The criteria for making decisions were not clear.
- Anonymous teacher input was disliked.
- Little or no observation was made of the evaluatee in action.

Several safeguards had been built into the Professional Personnel Evaluation System and the administrators wanted the same safeguards for themselves. The teachers had strong peer representatives and the administrators did not at that time. The District's administrators have since greatly strengthened their peer representative group and therefore they are now a much stronger force in the District.

Large School Districts Surveyed

In January of 1979, ORE surveyed most of the large school districts in the United States on their teacher and administrator evaluation systems. Eighty percent of the districts surveyed responded. While their responses did not provide clear directives as to which competencies should be included in the evaluation of school district administrators, their responses did provide some guidelines. Listed below are the general competency areas upon which the responding districts evaluated their administrators and the percentage of the respondents citing each area.

Competency Area	Percentage
Instructional Leadership	91%
Planning	91%
School-Community Relations	91%
Organization	89%
Managerial Ability	88%
Decision Making	81%

Competency Area	Percentage
Professional Knowledge	81%
Professional Development	75%
Plant Management	73%
Business Administration	70%
Discipline of Pupils	70%
Professional Involvement	66%
Supervising Pupil Records and Attendance	65%
Activity Programs	43%

Literature Review

Very little was available in the educational literature on actual administrator competencies. Most of the articles, presentations, etc., focused on philosophy, theory, or politics and not on competencies or evaluation systems. The management literature was the most helpful, in that general administrative competencies could be easily identified and seemed applicable to administrators in education settings. Among the general administrative skills were competencies related to planning, organizing, staffing, and leading/implementing.

Survey of Large Local Businesses and Governmental Agencies

Since the management and organizational literature seemed to offer the most direction in developing an evaluation system, 140 local businesses and government agencies were surveyed on their evaluation practices in the summer of 1979. The survey questions asked about their administrative/managerial evaluation systems. Forty-nine percent of those surveyed responded.

Over 60% of the respondents had a formal evaluation system. The majority of these systems were competency-based and used a standard evaluation form. Over one-half of the respondents employed some sort of goal setting as part of the evaluation process. The major data-gathering tool was direct observation of the employee at work. Businesses used sales and customer satisfaction in their evaluation practices more so than government agencies. Yearly evaluations were the norm with the evaluatee's immediate supervisor being the evaluator. The evaluation process was most frequently used to determine areas in need of improvement and to identify employees for raises, bonuses, or promotions.

Initial Development of Evaluation Documents

After gathering data from the various sources, it was felt a competency-based instrument was advisable. Late in the summer of 1979 a list of proposed competencies was drafted. Since AISD has a large range of administrative positions, a very broad and general set of competencies was developed so as to be applicable to all the positions. For example, some of the competencies were:

- *Gathers information.*
- *Structures activities for efficient and effective outcomes.*
- *Assures accurate and up-to-date records and reports.*

Task descriptions were drafted to accompany the general competencies. The task descriptions defined a competency in terms of the responsibilities associated with a specific administrative position. For example, given the general competency *Designs Plans and Programs* the task descriptions for a principal included:

- Oversees the development of the master schedule and registration procedures.
- Uses student test data and input from teachers and other District personnel to improve the school's curriculum.

Given the same competency, the task descriptions for an assistant superintendent included:

- Provides leadership and coordination of activities in the areas of educational planning and implementation, and curriculum design and development.
- Plans the educational specifications for new elementary and secondary school buildings, and advises with regard to existing facilities, modification, and renovations.

Draft task descriptions for each administrative position were generated using the job descriptions developed during a districtwide salary study. It soon became obvious, however, that many of these descriptions were inadequate and would need revision after the competencies were finalized.

A plan was developed in which all administrators would be surveyed on the importance of each proposed competency for their own position as well as for two other administrative positions. A sample of AISD professionals would rate the competencies as well. The original plan was to conduct the surveys in September and finalize the competencies in the fall of 1979. During this time documentation of how the proposed system was to operate would be completed, and improvements would be made on the task descriptions.

Intended Implementation

In order to facilitate transition into the new Administrator Evaluation System and to identify any problems, the new system was to be implemented in phases.

In the first year of operation it would be used only with upper-level central office staff. In the second year of implementation it would be used with all administrators. A calendar of the proposed phases was developed so everyone would be aware of each step in the developmental process.

As with the Professional Personnel Evaluation System, the new Administrator Evaluation System was scheduled to be presented to all administrators during training sessions in the spring and summer. The new system would then be used with the upper-level central office administrators the following year. The director and assistant directors of the Department of Staff Personnel and the Director of ORE spoke at several administrator staff meetings to inform District personnel of what was happening.

Two events happened in late summer which had a great impact on the District. The Superintendent announced he would not renew his contract and the District's desegregation case (which had been pending in court for several years) was scheduled to be decided during the 1979-80 school year. These items held everyone's attention for several months, during which the Superintendent requested that all activities on the revision of the Administrator Evaluation System be suspended. With the implementation of a new desegregation plan, the Superintendent did not feel the District administrators had the time or commitment needed to continue with the revision of the evaluation activities. He also felt the new superintendent should be given the opportunity to have input into the new Administrator Evaluation System. All plans for revising the system, therefore, were delayed indefinitely until the next school year.

Another Start and Stop

In September 1980, the new Superintendent told the Director of ORE and the Director of Staff Personnel to proceed with the revisions in the Administrator Evaluation System. At that point it was decided administrative input would be more valuable on the draft task descriptions rather than the competencies, so the plan for having administrators and teachers rate the importance of the competencies was abandoned.

A committee with representatives from all administrative positions was established and began planning the details of the new Administrator Evaluation System. The planning was interrupted again, however, when the new Superintendent announced a reorganization study was to be conducted of all administrative positions. Since it was likely positions would be redefined as a result of the study, a decision was made to postpone the revision activities for the time being.

Impetus to Begin Again

In the summer of 1981 a legislative act of the Texas legislature was interpreted to mean that all administrators were to be evaluated each year.

Since the current Administrator Evaluation System did not provide for annual evaluations, it was decided to insert this provision in the new Administrator Evaluation System. At this point great haste was made to finish the revisions so the new system could be implemented during the 1981-82 school year. The following pages list the activities that were conducted in order to complete the revision of the Administrator Evaluation System.

September, 1981

Instruction and Personnel decided the new system should be piloted with all instructional administrators during 1981-82 (principals, assistant principals, instuctional coordinators, etc.).

In order to avoid problems resulting from the rating scale used in the Professional Personnel Evaluation System (5 = outstanding, 4 = strong, 3 = good/expected, 2 = minimally acceptable, 1 = not acceptable), it was decided to use a new scale that had descriptors but no numbers (model performance, professional performance, growth performance, conditional performance, contractual difficulty performance).

All administrators were asked to review the task descriptions for their positions and for a sample of other administrative positions. The task descriptions were modified on the basis of their input.

All administrators completed Feedback Forms to indicate the extent of their satisfaction with the proposed evaluation procedures.

Analysis of the Feedback Forms revealed:

- Over half of the administrators were satisfied with the new rating scale.
- There was no clear consensus as to who should have input in the assessment of an evaluatee's performance.
- 93% agreed the completed evaluation form should be reviewed by the evaluator's immediate superior.
- 93% were satisfied with the projected evaluation schedule.
- 98% agreed administrators scheduled for contract renewal should be assessed on personal goals and the competency ratings, while those not scheduled for contract renewal should be assessed on personal goals alone.

On the basis of the data from the Feedback Forms, a three-page set of general Evaluation Procedures was developed for the new Administrator Evaluation System.

October, 1981

Several input forms were developed to use in obtaining information from other administrators and professionals about an evaluatee's performance.

The Superintendent approved the draft Evaluation Procedures and the Administrator Evaluator Form, with the stipulation that principals and assistant principals be evaluated on three student outcomes as well as the competencies. The student outcome measures were:

- Demonstrates student learning is taking place.
- Demonstrates students are attending school and are in their proper classes.
- Demonstrates effective use of the discipline policy.

November, 1981

All principals and instructional coordinators (the two largest administrative groups) reviewed their revised task descriptions and the modified Administrator Evaluation Form. A sample of administrators in other positions performed the same activities. Some revisions were made on the basis of the comments received.

On the basis of information received from the associate superintendents, assistant superintendents, and directors, a decision was made as to who should have input in the evaluation of an employee's performance.

At the suggestion of the Superintendent, copies of the new evaluation documents were sent to the president of the Teacher's Association. She was invited to react and provide input.

December, 1981

The Cabinet reviewed and approved the new pilot Administrator Evaluation System.

February, 1982

A publication date was set for printing and disseminating the evaluation documents for the pilot year.

The Administrator's Association sent a letter to the Superintendent expressing concern about a number of issues, including:

- the new rating scale,
- the use of teacher input in the evaluation of principals and assistant principals, and
- the need for signatures on teacher input forms.

The Superintendent answered the questions raised by the administrators and appointed a committee to review, revise, develop, and/or clarify all issues related to administrator evaluation. The Superintendent said special consideration would be given to the administrators' concerns prior to finalizing the procedures for 1982-83.

March through July, 1982

The committee appointed by the Superintendent outlined the sections to be placed in the new Administrator Evaluation Handbook. The sections had the same titles as those used in the Professional Personnel Evaluation Handbook. These were:

- Required Procedures
- Recommended Procedures
- Contractual Difficulties
- Resources
- Attachments

A draft of each section was written and a Personal Goals Form was developed.

For the purposes of the 1981-82 school year, the Superintendent announced:

- The same five-point numerical rating scale would be used to evaluate administrative performance as professional performance.

- Teacher input would be obtained for all principals and assistant principals scheduled for contract renewal. Signatures were not required on the teacher input forms. The teacher input forms would be distributed, collected, and summarized by the evaluatee, and shared with the evaluator during the evaluation conference.

August, 1982

At a special workshop, all principals, instructional coordinators, and central administrators had the opportunity to review the "Required Procedures" section of the new Administrator Evaluation System and provide feedback.

The feedback received revealed 87% of the administrators rated the new system as adequate or better.

The biggest controversy concerned the collection of teacher input for principals and assistant principals. Principals felt the collection and sharing of such input should be optional and that all teacher input forms should be signed. Teachers felt the collection of such input should be mandatory and all teacher input forms should be anonymous.

September through November, 1982

The remaining sections of the new Administrator Evaluation Handbook were completed and administrators had the opportunity to provide input on each.

Modifications were made on the basis of the input received.

December, 1982 — The date was set for publishing and disseminating the new Administrator Evaluation Handbooks.

The Administrator's Association sent a letter to the Superintendent expressing their concerns about the use of teacher input and made several recommendations. Publication of the handbook was delayed until the concerns were resolved.

January, 1983 — The Superintendent accepted the recommendations made by the Administrator's Association. According to the recommendations, the collection of teacner input would be optional (except in cases of suspected contractual difficulty) and teacher signatures would not be required.

Feburary, 1983 — The president of the Teacher's Association was asked to review the recommendations made by the Administrator's Association. The president said the recommendations were unacceptable, in that the collection of teacher input should be mandatory. The publication of the new Administrative Personnel Evaluation Handbook has been delayed until this issue has been resolved.

Products

Several instruments and a set of evaluation procedures were developed as a result of the revision activities. The instruments include:

- *The Administrator Evaluation Form* (Attachment A)
- *Task Descriptions* for each major administrative position in the District.
- A *Personal Goal Form* for goal development and goal assessment (Attachment B)
- Various *input forms* to be used by District personnel in commenting on an evaluatee's performance.
- The *Administrator Evaluation Schedule* (Attachment C)
- The *Administrative Personnel Evaluation Handbook* which provides details on required and recommended evaluation procedures, evaluation procedures for evaluatees in contractual difficulties, and a list of resources for professional development.

Observations

There were significant differences in the manner in which the Professional and Administrator Evaluation Systems were developed and implemented. These differences include the following:

Professional System	Administrator System
All teachers and instructional administrators were involved in the development process.	All administrators were involved in the development process. Very little teacher input was obtained.
The development of the system was obviously a District priority and it was clear who was responsible for the project.	The development of the system was not a District priority. During several stages of the development phase it was not clear who was responsible for the project.
The system and its development got lots of exposure in meetings, District publications, newsletters, etc.	The revision procedures were discussed at meetings when information was needed or controversies arose. It received little exposure in District publications.
The system was documented and disseminated before it was implemented.	Approximately 30% of the system was drafted when it was implemented in the first pilot year (1982).
The evaluators were "walked-through" the system the year before the system was implemented.	The evaluators received written instructions as to how to implement the system during the first pilot year.
Several workshops were held for evaluators to improve observation and other evaluation skills before the system was implemented.	No workshops were held to improve evaluation skills.

Professional System	Administrator System
Staff development was prepared and given to teachers the year before the system began. These efforts included a video tape that was shown at all schools. This video tape was an introduction to the system with various groups- the administration, personnel, the president of the Austin Association of Teachers all lending their support to the system.	Staff development in the system has not been provided. Support for the system has not been publicly expressed by any group.
The individuals who could provide input about a professional's performance were clearly defined.	The individuals who could provide input about an evaluator's performance and the manner in which the input could be provided are still unresolved.
There were no "stops" in the development process.	"Stops and starts" abounded. Enthusiasm for the project declined with each postponement.
The system was subjected to extensive evaluation in its first year of operation. Training and feedback continued through the end of the first year.	Since the new system was hurriedly implemented on a pilot basis at the end of a school year, almost no evaluation activities were conducted. No training was provided at any time.
The handbooks or documentation of the system were readily available at all locations.	The handbooks are currently not available due to the unresolved issues related to teacher input.

Conclusions

1) The Professional Personnel Evaluation System established expectations for the Administrator Evaluation System. Many administrators were well acquainted with the Professional Evaluation System and wanted to keep procedures in which they were experienced.

2) Administrator Evaluation Systems cannot be developed overnight. District personnel must be given the opportunity to provide input and review draft procedures. District personnel resent procedures which are designed and implemented too quickly.

3) It is important to identify the objectives of the evaluation process before the revision procedures begin so the objectives can guide the development process. Is the purpose of the evaluation system to promote personal growth? to promote rapport between the evaluatee and evaluator? to satisfy legal requirements? to identify districtwide staff development needs? to improve evaluation skills?

4) One person or committee should be responsible for planning and supervising the revision activities. Fragmented authority or having no one with final responsibility for the process results in frustration and inefficiency.

5) Teachers want the opportunity to provide input in the development of an Administrator Evaluation System. Teacher representatives should be assigned to committees whenever appropriate.

6) Documentation should be kept of the opportunities different groups have to provide input in the development of the system. This is the most effective response to faulty memories or complaints of non-involvement.

7) Two issues likely to cause controversy are:

   . Who should provide input in the evaluation of an administrator?
   . Who should be required to sign input forms?

   Discussion of these two issues often resulted in other issues being neglected during input sessions.

8) Administrators who have confidence in their evaluators are usually content to leave some issues to the evaluator's discretion. Administrators who lack confidence in their evaluators often want each procedure detailed to insure their protection.

9) What seems best for the evaluatee is not always the best position in which to place the District. This trade-off must be a constant consideration, especially when generating required evaluation procedures and procedures for administrators in contractual difficulty.

10) Impetus for change decreases if too many interruptions occur.

11) Development of an evaluation system should be seen as a districtwide priority and should receive visible support from the Board and Superintendent if the necessary cooperation is to be obtained.

12) On-going districtwide communication about the development and implementation of a personnel evaluation system is invaluable in gaining the acceptance of the system by District personnel. Communication should be via varying methods (newsletters, meetings, handbooks, etc.).

Further Information

Since this paper focused on the development of the AISD Administrator Evaluation System, few details were given of the Professional Personnel Evaluation System, and its development. Its development and evaluation are documented in several Office of Research and Evaluation publications. Three in particular (since they are broad in scope) are:

Austin Independent School District. Professional Personnel Evaluation Handbook. Austin: Austin Independent School District, 1977.

Christner, C. A., Malitz, D., Kugle, C., and Calkins, D. Competency-based teacher evaluation in a school district: Validation of the competencies' importance by district administrators, professionals, students, and parents. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979.

Holley, F. M. An Alternative Approach to Assuring Teacher Competence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of The American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1980.

In the next few months the Districts' Administrator Evaluation Handbook should be available.

Please contact the Office of Research and Evaluation re: the availability and prices of these and other materials.

Attachment A

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FORM

19☐☐

LAST NAME ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ FIRST NAME ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ M.I. ☐

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ POSITION _____ SCHOOL CODE ☐☐☐

SCHOOL/LOCATION _____

Circle the appropriate status below:

PRESENT CONTRACT STATUS-Probationary/Term: 1P1 1P2 1P3 1P4 P1 3 2 1 1R 2R

PRESENT EVALUATION STATUS-Grant Contract: 1G1 1G2 1G3 3GT 2GT 1GT 1GR 2GR

Directions:
The following statements describe the administrator who achieves success. Based on performance information, estimate the administrator's effectiveness in meeting each criterion. Circle the number below the descriptor which most closely fits the situation. After reviewing the ratings, the administrator may check the last column if there is disagreement.

COMPETENCIES	INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION	OUTSTANDING	STRONG	GOOD/EXPECTED	MINIMALLY ACCEPTABLE	UNACCEPTABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	EVALUATOR DISAGREES
PERSONAL QUALITIES								
1. Is physically capable of performing assigned tasks.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
2. Exhibits poise and self-control.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
3. Uses common sense/behaves realistically.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
4. Shows enthusiasm for work.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
5. Presents an effective role model.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS								
Planning								
6. Gathers information.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
7. Analyzes information.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
8. Establishes/uses priorities.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
9. Establishes/follows policies (rules, regulations, and procedures).	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
10. Designs plans and programs.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
11. Determines resource requirements.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
12. Seeks resources.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
13. Prepares budget(s).	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
14. Disseminates information.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Organizing								
15. Structures activities for efficient and effective outcomes.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
16. Delegates responsibility, authority, and resources.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
17. Coordinates activities and tasks.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Staffing								
18. Determines staffing needs.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
19. Selects staff.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
20. Promotes staff development.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
21. Evaluates staff.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
22. Makes promotion/termination decisions.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Leading/Implementing								
23. Inspires/motivates staff.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
24. Assures effective communication.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
25. Consults with others on area(s) of responsibility.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
26. Carries out activities in areas of responsibility.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
27. Evaluates/monitors in area(s) of responsibility.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
28. Establishes/achieves standards.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
29. Takes corrective action(s) regarding people and programs.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
30. Assures accurate and up-to-date records and reports.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
31. Assures fiscal responsibility in area(s) of responsibility.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
32. Promotes good public relations.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Technical Expertise								
33. Demonstrates practical application of technical knowledge.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
STUDENT OUTCOMES								
The purpose of the District is to foster the growth and development of students. Therefore, student outcomes are among the prime factors on which the administrator should be evaluated.								
A. Demonstrates that student learning is taking place.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
B. Demonstrates students are attending school and are in their proper classes.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	
C. Demonstrates effective use of the discipline policy.	X	5	4	3	2	1	0	

GENERAL EVALUATION STATEMENT: Summary statement about overall performance, including statements on unusual strengths and/or weaknesses.

EVALUATEE'S COMMENTS: Summary statement of disagreement with any of the performance ratings.

I have read this evaluation, and after a conference with my evaluator about it, I have received a copy of the completed evaluation instrument.

SIGNATURE OF EVALUATEE: _____ DATE: _____

EVALUATOR"S RECOMMENDATION: REMARKS:

SIGNATURE OF EVALUATOR: _____ DATE: _____

82.43

PERSONAL GOAL FORM

NAME :_____ CURRENT YEAR :_____

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER :_____ CURRENT CONTRACT/ EVALUATION STATUS :_____

I. GOAL ASSESSMENT: On the basis of performance information, assess the attainment of each goal using the following ratings: 5 = Outstanding; 4 = Strong; 3 = Good/Expected; 2 = Minimally Acceptable; 1 = Unacceptable.

	GOALS	RATING
1.		____
2.		____
3.		____

II. GOAL DEVELOPMENT: Identify Personal Goals for the upcoming year.

1.

2.

3.

Evaluator's Comments:

Evaluatee's Comments:

Signatures:

Evaluator _____ Evaluatee _____ Date _____

The Administrator Evaluation Schedule

The evaluation process is shown as a series of steps. Steps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 14 show the steps taken for individuals who are not in contractual difficulty. Steps 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are additional steps which are needed for individuals whose contract renewal is in question. The steps for individuals in contractual difficulty are "shaded" for easy identification.

STEP 1 SEPTEMBER 1 THRU DECEMBER 1

(SHADED STEPS ARE ONLY FOR EVALUATEES IN CONTRACTUAL DIFFICULTY)

- [redacted]
- [redacted]
- [redacted]
- [redacted]
- [redacted]

STEP 2 BY SEPTEMBER 30

- THE OFFICE OF STAFF PERSONNEL WILL GIVE EACH EVALUATOR A LIST OF THE ADMINISTRATORS TO BE ASSESSED BY THE EVALUATOR DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR. THE LIST WILL INDICATE THOSE WHO:

STEP 2 (CONTINUED)

1) ARE NEW ADMINISTRATORS
2) HAVE CHANGED ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS WITHIN THE DISTRICT
3) ARE SCHEDULED FOR FULL EVALUATION
4) ARE SCHEDULED FOR INTERIM EVALUATION.

- THE OFFICE OF STAFF PERSONNEL WILL SEND EVALUATORS THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER OF NEW ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL EVALUATION FORMS AND PERSONAL GOAL FORMS FOR FALL ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES.

- THE OFFICE OF STAFF PERSONNEL WILL SEND EVALUATORS THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FORMS AND PERSONAL GOAL FORMS FOR THE FULL AND INTERIM EVALUATIONS IN THE SPRING.

STEP 3 BY SEPTEMBER 30

- THE OFFICE OF STAFF PERSONNEL WILL GIVE THE SUPERINTENDENT A LIST OF ALL ADMINISTRATORS TO BE EVALUATED DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR. THE LIST WILL INDICATE WHO WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE FALL EVALUATION ACTIVITIES AS WELL AS THOSE WHO WILL RECEIVE FULL AND INTERIM EVALUATIONS.

- THE OFFICE OF STAFF PERSONNEL WILL GIVE THE ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENTS OF OPERATIONS AND INSTRUCTION A LIST OF THE ADMINISTRATORS IN THEIR RESPECTIVE DIVISION TO BE EVALUATED. THE LIST WILL INDICATE WHO WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE FALL EVALUATION ACTIVITIES AS WELL AS THOSE WHO WILL RECEIVE FULL AND INTERIM EVALUATIONS.

STEP 4	SEPTEMBER 30 THRU NOVEMBER 1	● EVALUATORS WILL COMPLETE THE NEW ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL EVALUATION FORMS AND PERSONAL GOAL FORMS FOR THE NEW ADMINISTRATORS. ● A COPY OF THE COMPLETED FORMS SHOULD BE SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT BY NOVEMBER 1. ● EVALUATORS WILL COMPLETE PERSONAL GOAL FORMS FOR ADMINISTRATORS WHO HAVE CHANGED ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS WITHIN THE DISTRICT. ● A COPY OF THE COMPLETED FORMS SHOULD BE SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT BY NOVEMBER 1.
STEP 5	NOVEMBER 1 THRU NOVEMBER 15	● THE ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENTS WILL REVIEW THE COMPLETED NEW ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL EVALUATION FORMS AND PERSONAL GOAL FORMS. THE FORMS SHOULD BE FORWARDED TO THE OFFICE OF STAFF PERSONNEL BY NOVEMBER 15.
STEP 6	NOVEMBER 15	● EACH ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT WILL PROVIDE THE SUPERINTENDENT WITH A BRIEF ASSESSMENT OF THE PERFORMANCE OF NEW ADMINISTRATORS AND ADMINISTRATORS WHO HAVE CHANGED ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS WITHIN THE DISTRICT.

STEP 7	DECEMBER 1 THRU JUNE 15	• EVALUATORS WILL COMPLETE ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FORMS AND PERSONAL GOAL FORMS FOR EVALUATEES SCHEDULED FOR FULL EVALUATION. • A COPY OF THE COMPLETED FORMS SHOULD BE SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT BY JUNE 15. • EVALUATORS WILL COMPLETE PERSONAL GOAL FORMS FOR EVALUATEES SCHEDULED FOR INTERIM EVALUATION. • A COPY OF THE COMPLETED FORMS SHOULD BE SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT BY JUNE 15.
STEP 8	BY FEBRUARY 1	• [redacted]
STEP 9	BY FEBRUARY 15	• [redacted]
STEP 10	BY MARCH 5	• [redacted]

STEP 11	BY MARCH 10	• [redacted]
STEP 12	PRIOR TO APRIL 1	• [redacted]
STEP 13	APRIL 1	• [redacted]
STEP 14	JUNE 15	• THE ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENTS WILL REVIEW THE COMPLETED ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FORMS AND PERSONAL GOAL FORMS. THE FORMS SHOULD BE FORWARDED TO THE OFFICE OF STAFF PERSONNEL.